



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,893	09/22/2006	Shaun Patrick Rymer	102792-518 (I1296PI US)	8060
27389	7590	03/17/2009		
NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS			EXAMINER	
875 THIRD AVE			SHARPE, DANIEL T	
18TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10022			3752	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/17/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/565,893	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RYMER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> DANIEL T. SHARPE	<b>Art Unit</b> 3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the arrangement with only one passageway provided with a deflector must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. It is unclear from the specification how one deflector plate extending parallel to the direction of flow is to be arranged with only one of the passageways.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1-3, and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harvey (US 6065643).**

Regarding claim 1: Harvey discloses a bottle having two reservoirs (11), a separate passageway from each reservoir, each passageway opening to the atmosphere (when the cap is removed as in figure 5), a deflector plate (39) between the openings, in contact with at least one of the liquid streams, the openings arranged so

Art Unit: 3752

that the liquid streams are caused to be deflected towards the other stream causing the streams to mix once they have passed the deflector plate.


Regarding claim 2: The passageways are side by side.

Regarding claim 3: A single deflector plate deflects liquid from both passageways.

Regarding claim 5: Each passageway has its own deflector plate as illustrated in examiner generated figure below.

Regarding claim 6: The free end of the deflector plate is tapered in the direction of the flow as shown in figure 3.

Regarding claim 7: The two passageways are substantially parallel as shown by the dotted line in the examiner generated figure below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3752

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. **Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

**Harvey (US 6065643) in view of Dubach (US 6439433).**

Harvey discloses all of the elements of claim 8 except for a nozzle angled in respect to the main axis of the bottle.

Dubach teaches the angling of the nozzle with respect to the container axis.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the container of Harvey with the angled neck of Dubach for the predictable result of directing the stream of mixed liquid to be directed at a predetermined angle to the bottle's axis.

6. **Claims 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

**unpatentable over Harvey (US 6065643) in view of Conway (US 6758411).**

Harvey discloses all of the elements of claims 9, 10, and 12 except for the viscosities of the liquids to be used and the use of a detergent in the device.

Conway teaches the use of low viscosity fluids in such a bottle, as well as teaching the use of such a bottle for dispensing a two part detergent solution. In column 1 lines 26-28, Conway teaches "an aqueous liquid detergent composition that is

prepared and delivered from a dual-compartment container". In column 15 lines 51-54, Conway provides "for example, viscosities of 10-30 centipoise when measured with a Brookfields viscometer...are suitable".

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to try using the container of Harvey with the detergent composition of the viscosity explicitly taught by Conway. It would produce the predictable result of providing a more complete and efficient mixing of the fluids.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/9/08 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With regard to the discussion of the 103 rejections on pages 9 through 13 of 14, the explanation of the 102 rejections above addresses the issues Applicant raises with regard to the 103 rejections.

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL T. SHARPE whose telephone number is (571)270-3766. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9-6 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on (571)272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daniel T Sharpe  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3752

ds

/Len Tran/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3752